

Application No. 10/054,735
Amendment "C" dated September 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed June 24, 2005

REMARKS

These remarks and the accompanying amendments are responsive to the Office Action made final and mailed June 24, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as the "Office Action"). The Office Action rejected each of the pending claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by United States patent number 6,594,490 issued to Toyoda et al. (hereinafter "Toyoda"). By this response, Claims 3 and 8-10 are cancelled, thereby leaving Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 pending for further consideration. The applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 4-7.

Regarding claims 1 and 4, at page 2, lines 5-9 of the Office Action states as follows:

[T]he applicants submitted that the Toyoda reference does not teach that the exchange changes a subscriber profile on the basis of a change request and retains the changed subscriber profile. The examiner states that in wireless communication system, the preceding limitations are inherent (e.g., see Sasuta et al. – U.S. 6,134,446 – column 1, lines 57-63 or Sanchez – U.S. 6,449,479 – column 4, lines 52-62).

This statement, however, seems to suggest that the Office Action misunderstood the applicant's argument presented in the Amendment "B" filed on October 25, 2004. Specifically, the feature of claims 1 and 4 that the applicants assert as distinguishing from Toyoda is not "retaining the changed subscriber profile", but "retaining information indicating that the subscriber profile has been changed" (emphasis added).

According to this feature, for example, when the mobile terminal moves from the service area of the current exchange to the service area of another exchange, the current exchange can decide whether it is necessary to transmit the changed subscriber profile to the home memory station or not.

Application No. 10/054,735
Amendment "C" dated September 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed June 24, 2005

This kind of feature is also not disclosed in either Toyoda, Sasuta (U.S. Pat. No. 6,134,446) or Sanchez (U.S. Pat. No. 6,449,479). Further, it is not inherent in a wireless communication system. Therefore, Claims 1 and 4 are not anticipated nor rendered unpatentable over Toyoda, Sasuta and Sanchez (either singly or in combination).

Regarding claims 2 and 5-7, page 2, lines 10-14 of the Office Action state as follows:

[T]he applicants submitted that the Toyoda reference does not teach that the subscriber profile is transmitted from the first exchange to the home memory station. The examiner states that in wireless communications system, it is inherent that when the profile of a mobile unit changes (i.e., change in subscription to service), the profile change will be communicated to the HLR (e.g., see Sasuta et al. – U.S. 6,134,446 – column 1, lines 57-63).

However, in claims 2 and 5-7, when the mobile terminal moves from the service area of the first exchange to the service area of the second exchange, the first exchange in whose service area the mobile terminal was previously present transmits the changed subscriber profile to the home memory station. This kind of feature is not disclosed in either of Sasuta or Toyoda. Further, it is not inherent in wireless communication system. That is, the normal method that one skilled in the art can conceive is that while the mobile terminal is present in the service area of an exchange and if the subscriber profile is changed, the exchange transmits the changed subscriber profile to the home memory station.

In contrast, in Claims 2 and 5-7, the first exchange in whose service area the mobile terminal was previously present transmits the changed subscriber profile to the home memory station. Further, the home memory station transmits the changed subscriber profile to the second exchange. Thus, this kind of feature is not disclosed in Toyoda and Sasuta, and it is not inherent in wireless communication system, and therefore, Claims 2 and 5-7 are not anticipated by, nor rendered unpatentable over Toyoda and Sasuta (either singly or in combination).

Application No. 10/054,735
Amendment "C" dated September 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed June 24, 2005

Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 should be withdrawn, and withdrawal is respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 22nd day of September, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



ADRIAN J. LEE
Registration No. 42,785
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913

AJL:ds
DS0000004073V001